

Appln No. 16/575,192
Amdt. Dated February 28, 2005
Response to Office Action of November 30, 2004

10

BEST AVAILABLE COPY**REMARKS**

The Office Action has been carefully considered. The issues raised are traversed and addressed below with reference to the relevant headings and paragraph numbers appearing under the Detailed Action of the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action the Examiner has objected to the claims on the basis of Lemelson. In particular, the Examiner has indicated that Lemelson teaches a method of providing a copy of at least one page of a printed document.

As previously highlighted by the Applicant in previous responses, we do not believe that this is the case. In particular, Lemelson does not describe providing a copy of a page of a printed document, but rather describes providing a different printed document.

The Examiner indicates that this limitation is not recited in the claim. Whilst we acknowledge that this is not explicitly stated in the claim, we respectfully submit that this limitation is inherent due to the claim structure. In particular, the claim states that the document which is printed is a copy of at least one page of a printed document and therefore the printed page is a printed copy of at least one page of the document itself.

As evidence of this, we draw the Examiner's attention to the fact that the claim clearly states that the copy of at least one page of the printed document is obtained by using coded data included on *the* document. Thus, coded data on the document is detected by a sensing device, allowing the at least one page to be printed. Thus, it is clear that the coded data on *the* document, is used to obtain a copy of a page of *the* document. We do not believe it is possible to apply any other interpretation to this claim and we therefore believe that the Examiner is incorrect in his assertion that this limitation is not provided in the claim.

Despite this the Applicant wishes to obtain speedy allowance of the case and has therefore amended the claim to refer to the document having disposed therein or thereon visible information with at least some of the coded data being coincident with the visible information. This is not taught or suggested by Lemelson in which the coded data in the form of the magnetic strip is clearly provided separate of all the visible information.

Appin No. 10/575,192
Amdt. Dated February 28, 2005
Response to Office Action of November 30, 2004

11

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

In view of this, we believe that claim 1 is novel and inventive over the prior art cited by the Examiner.

In addition to this, similar amendments have been made to the other independent claims.

Furthermore claim 28 has been amended to overcome the objection to the dependencies and claim 24 revised to correct a grammatical error.

Appln No. 10/575,192
Amdt. Dated February 28, 2005
Response to Office Action of November 30, 2004

12

BEST AVAILABLE COPY**CONCLUSION**

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and claim rejections have been successfully traversed and addressed. The amendments do not involve adding any information that was not already disclosed in the specification, and therefore no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims 1 to 28, and the application as a whole with these claims, are allowable, and a favourable reconsideration is therefore earnestly solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

Applicant:



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email:

kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone:

+612 9818 6633

Facsimile:

+61 2 9555 7762